## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated 15 May 2003. Responsive to the rejections made in the Official Action, Claims 1-14 have been cancelled by this Amendment and replaced by new Claims 15-28.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102, as being anticipated by Arakawa, et al., U.S. Patent #5,603,145. Claims 3-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103, as being unpatentable over Arakawa, et al. in view of Brumlik, U.S. Patent #4,198,734, and Claims 11 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103, as being unpatentable over Arakawa, et al. Still further, Claims 12 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103, as being unpatentable over Arakawa, et al. in view of Bries, et al., U.S. Patent #6,001,471.

Before discussing the prior art relied upon by the Examiner, it is believed beneficial to first briefly review the structure of the invention of the subject Patent Application, as now claimed. The invention of the subject Patent Application is directed to an adhesive strip for suspending and hanging an object on a surface. The adhesive strip includes a longitudinally extended base plate having first and second opposing sides. The base plate includes at least one integrally formed fin extending between opposing longitudinal ends of the base plate. The at least one fin extends outwardly from the first side of the base plate. The adhesive

strip further includes an adhesive layer attached to the second side of the base plate. The

adhesive strip is separable into two pieces, a first of the two pieces being secured to an object

and a second of the two pieces being secured to a supporting surface in an inverted

orientation with respect to the first piece for releasable interlocking of the fins of the two

pieces to suspend the object from the surface.

In contradistinction, the Arakawa, et al. reference is directed to a sheet-form hook and

fastening system. As clearly shown in FIG. 1, the sheet-form substrate 1 has a plurality of

projected portions 2 that are punched therefrom to define a plurality of individual hooks,

which hooks may be formed in multiple rows, each row having a multiplicity of hooks

longitudinally spaced therein. While the reference discloses that the hooks of one sheet-form

may be hooked to the hooks of another, nowhere does the reference disclose or suggest that

the sheet-forms are respectively adhered to an object and a supporting surface, wherein one

such sheet-form is disposed in an <u>inverted orientation with respect to</u> the other <u>for releasable</u>

interlocking thereof to suspend the object from the supporting surface. Further, in order for

the hooks of two sheet-form substrates to engage one another, the substrates must be

precisely aligned in two directions, vertically and longitudinally. Nowhere does the

reference disclose or suggest extending a projection 2 between opposing longitudinal ends

of the substrate. In fact, such a structure is not possible in the referenced system, since the

Page 7 of 9

projections 2 are disclosed as being "punched" from the substrate and therefore require

substrate material to be disposed on opposing longitudinal sides of the projection 2. Further,

the reference fails to disclose or suggest separating the system into two pieces to apply to an

object and a supporting surface, as now claimed.

Whereas in the invention of the subject Patent Application, the at least one fin extends

between opposing longitudinal ends of the base plate. By that arrangement, the two pieces

of the adhesive strip need only be precisely aligned in the vertical direction. Thus, the

Arakawa, et al. reference cannot anticipate the invention of the subject Patent Application,

as now defined in Claim 15, as it fails to disclose each and every one of the elements of the

invention of the subject Patent Application, as now claimed. Further, as the reference fails

to suggest such a combination of elements, it cannot anticipate that invention either.

The Brumlik reference does not overcome the deficiencies of Arakawa, et al. The

Brumlik reference is directed to a self-gripping device having a base with a plurality of

gripping elements attached thereto. Here again, the structure provides a base from which a

plurality of hook-like elements extend, rather than fins, which extend between opposing

longitudinal ends of the base. The reference also fails to disclose or suggest separating the

device into two pieces and respectively adhering them to an object and a supporting surface,

where one piece is inverted relative to the other. Thus, the combination of Brumlik and

Page 8 of 9

MR929-737 S.N. 10/045,143 Amendment dated 14 August 2003 Reply to Office Action of 15 May 2003

Arakawa, et al. cannot make obvious the invention of the subject Patent Application, as now claimed.

The Bries, et al. reference does not overcome the deficiencies of Arakawa, et al. The Bries, et al. reference is directed to a removable adhesive tape having controlled sequential release. The tape 10 is joined to a hook 42 to which an object may be hung. Nowhere does the reference disclose or suggest providing a base plate having an integrally formed fin extending between opposing longitudinal ends of the base plate, as now claimed. The reference also fails to disclose or suggest separating the device into two pieces and respectively adhering them to an object and a supporting surface, where one piece is inverted relative to the other. Thus, the combination of Bries, et al. and Arakawa, et al. cannot make obvious the invention of the subject Patent Application, as now claimed.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE

Suite 101 3458 Ellicott Center Drive Ellicott City, MD 21043 (410) 465-6678

David I. Klein

Registration #33.2

Registration #33,253

Dated: 14 Aug. 2003

Page 9 of 9

